

changes in our spending and taxation and get out of town by the end of October we will not have been careful. We will have simply rushed something through. We cannot get it done in October, and we cannot wait till February.

And so we in Congress ought to be willing to be here through the month of November to do what this country needs but to do it carefully.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM DEMONSTRATION FEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

CAPITAL GAINS

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first before I discuss what I intend to discuss here for a few minutes, a matter of importance, the National Park System, let me make a brief comment on capital gains.

Depending on when the effective date of the capital gains cut came in, it is unlikely that a whole lot of people in the stock market have capital gains. But we are also looking at real estate questions, at companies expanding. And the idea that somehow we will spend our way out of a recession, rather than grow our way out, is backwards. If we do not have real substantive incentives to get people back to work in all sectors of our economy, we are in deep trouble in this economy.

DEMONSTRATION FEES

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about demonstration fees. This was supposedly a test to see whether it would relieve the financial pressures on our national parks. At some point, either this demonstration has worked or it has not. It is time to either make them permanent or remove them. In fact, we have had very few complaints, almost none at most parks. The fees range from \$10 to \$30 to enter the park, negligible compared to most entertainment in America. Fees for special services for those related costs, camping, back country expenses, are logical because the money goes directly to pay for those expenses.

These fee dollars have helped supplement the park's complete projects efforts. For example, 6 percent in 1999 of Yellowstone Park's revenue were from the demonstrations fee. The less attended park, Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, netted about \$300,000 a year for projects. In the year 2000 that included projects such as boundary fence repair, overlook trails, radio-collar elk monitoring, trailhead and interior trail signs throughout the park, new laser slide programs for a visitor center and an archeological exhibit at the Medora Visitor Center.

Fee uses are diverse, visitor service usage intensive with these fees and all, help fund unmet park needs. The long-range source problem is that Congress and/or the President keep adding additional units to the National Park Service. This has been especially true or has actually been true since the foundation of the Park System and will always be true. It is only a question of degree. So the park service gets more units and their budget does not increase at the rate of responsibilities.

So we have developed associations like the Rocky Mountain National Nature Association at the Rocky Mountain National Park or the Yosemite Fund at Yosemite National Park, plus concession fees to help meet these needs.

The demonstration fees have also helped supplement these budgets. This has, in fact, led to an unofficial "crown jewel" approach. Former Park Director James Ridenhour argued that Congressional "park-barreling" was diluting the national vision and uniqueness of the National Park System. In fact, the major natural parks plus the major cultural parks have the strongest financial support groups and the most demo fees. People are voting with their own dollars by giving it through the funds, associations, and their park fees.

These demonstration fees should be made permanent because they have become an essential part of preserving our most popular and beloved parks. But, ironically, the National Park pass is beginning to threaten the success story. This was further complicated by our so-called technical corrections to the National Parks' Omnibus Management Act.

Each park has historically kept most of the demonstration fee collected at the gate. Because most projects require planning of multiple years, they plan ahead. Parks also get to keep a significant percentage of the national parks pass fees sold at that park. But as more parks put in demo fees and as demo fees have risen, those who visit multiple parks or visit one park frequently obviously purchase a pass. The more passes sold disadvantage the more remote parks. Demonstration fees not collected or passes not sold at those parks dramatically reduce the revenue at those parks which was, after all, the original purpose.

Furthermore, the Technical Corrections Act set aside 15 percent of sales for administration and promotion of the National Parks Pass. Obviously we have administration costs, and that is a whole other subject. But why are we promoting the national parks pass? National sales and Internet take dollars from specific parks, draining the original intent. There is no data to suggest that promoting the pass in general increases usage of the parks. It just goes to the Washington office rather than the individual park. And even if it did increase usage, that is the wrong goal.

Parks with demonstration fees which need a pass are generally nearly overcrowded in peak seasons already. Why would we want to have more people go to them? Every person who purchases a day pass at a park is given the option of purchasing a national parks pass, so no one is getting shortchanged. Furthermore, the cost of the national parks pass has become too low. As some parks go up to \$30, we need to re-evaluate the system.

We need to look at making it \$100 and there are two problems with that: Low-income families and local residents. A ZIP code criteria for a lower fee is a possibility. Although there is no philosophical defense for that, it may need to be a practical consideration. A refundable tax credit for low-income families would address the income problem. It would cost the government nothing because the people who laid out the \$100 are just getting it back, likely would cost the parks little, but would eliminate the complaint that poor families could not afford the \$100. If we do not address this problem, our park revenue is going to decline. It is something we must address for the sake of our national parks.

ANTITERRORISM AND HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the CIA has a budget of over \$30 billion. The FBI has a budget of over \$3 billion. In addition, \$10 to \$12 billion are specifically designated to fighting terrorism. Yet, with all this money and power, we were not warned of the events that befell us on September 11.

Since the tragic attacks, our officials have located and arrested hundreds of suspects, frozen millions of dollars of assets and gotten authority to launch a military attack against the ring leaders in Afghanistan. It seems the war against terrorists or guerillas, if one really believes we are in an actual war, has so far been carried out satisfactorily and under current law. But the question is do we really need a war against the civil liberties of the American people?

We should never casually sacrifice any of our freedoms for the sake of a perceived security. Most security, especially in a free society, is best carried out by individuals protecting their own property and their own lives. The founders certainly understood this and is the main reason we have the second amendment. We cannot have a policeman stationed in each of our homes to prevent burglaries, but owners with property with possession of a gun can easily do it. A new giant agency for homeland security cannot provide security, but it can severely undermine